From: John V. Fox

To: SR 520 DEIS Comments;

CC: Ziegler, Jennifer; tim.ceis@seattle.gov; sally.clark@seattle.

gov; richard.conlin@seattle.gov; david.della@seattle.gov; jan.

drago@seattle.gov; jean.godden@seattle.gov; nick. licata@seattle.gov; richard.mciver@seattle.gov; tom. rasmussen@seattle.gov; peter.steinbrueck@seattle.gov;

Subject: Our comments on the SR520 DEIS - please review and include

- and say "NO" to Pacific Street Interchange Option

Date: Tuesday, October 31, 2006 11:34:59 AM

Attachments:

Comments on DEIS for 520 from the Seattle Displacement Coalition

October 31, 2006

Paul Krueger WSDOT 414 Olive Way, Suite 400 Seattle, WA 98101

Re: Comments on the SR520 DEIS

The Seattle Displacement Coalition is a 29 year-old city-wide coalition of community, housing, church, and social service organizations committed to the preservation and expansion of low income housing opportunities here in Seattle. We also have assisted numerous neighborhood groups over the years responding to public and private developments that threaten both the physical and social character of those areas. Our organization is responding to this specific transportation issue - SR520 expansion - because all six-lane alternatives especially the Pacific Interchange Option pose such a significant danger to Seattle's neighborhoods - their liveability and affordability.

C-019-001

We simply cannot afford to move forward with any of these six lane options given the significant unavoidable adverse impacts that accompany each of them - especially the Pacific Interchange option that will so threaten valuable wetlands, create extraordinary unmitigated noise and visual blight, air pollution, and spill a level of traffic into the University District that cannot be reasonably managed or

C-019-001

Comment Summary:

Pacific Street Interchange Option

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

C-019-001

mitigated. Gridlock will be the inevitable result. The DEIS fails to adequately consider these direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts associated with any of the six lane alternatives. It also fails to give full consideration to the broad range of four lane alternatives that when coupled with bike, transit, TDM, and other mitigation measures could reasonably address traffic demand along 520 for decades to come.

C-019-002

At the core of this debate over options for 520 is a rather fundamental issue - the six lane options and their designs especially the Pacific Street Interchange are all geared not simply to absorb manageable and reasonable levels of growth (while trying to help shift more commuters from cars to buses and other modes) through that corridor, they are consciously designed to accommodate expanded and accelerated rates of growth both on the Eastside and in downtown Seattle.

The growth first - pro-density- pro-displacement crowd - see expansion of 520, a waterfront tunnel, mercer expansion, all these so called improvements as necessary in order to feed the downtown highrise growth machine which is not sustainable either in terms of Seattle or the region's ability to accommodate it - not without enormous unavoidable impacts on affordability of our housing and our city and region's physical environment. Our city cannot add enough housing to accompany the runaway growth and that translates into ever escalating housing costs and displacement. More is better....it fuels growth... more office space and bio-tech in downtown - feeds our property values - feeds our wallets - and feeds the gentrification displacement beast that is destroying our city and increasing the ranks of the homeless and driving up housing cost for all of us.

Further, when half the new downtown office workers choose to live on the eastside - they will continue to demand more and more freeway lanes such as the six lane 520 options to get them into downtown. The cost of moving this increasing number of commuters who live farther and farther out on the Eastside to and from their jobs in downtown is enormous and simply unsustainable. Nor can we afford a regional growth model premised on downtown Seattle continuing to absorb 60 percent of the regions office growth. Expanding 520 to six lanes merely fuels these unsustainable trends. The DEIS gives no consideration to these population, land use, and housing effects. Nor does the DEIS give consideration of other regional growth models such as a poly-centered approach to growth that would more evenly distribute growth among all activity centers in the region thereby obviating the need for more freeway lanes and dovetailing with more cost effective and environmentally sensitive approaches for 520.

C-019-002

Comment Summary:

Regional Land Use and Transportation Planning

Response:

See Section 6.4 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.

C-019-002

We cannot afford the cost of adding these freeway lanes in terms of real dollars and more importantly we cannot afford the devastating impacts that will result on our neighborhoods - as is evidenced by the extraordinary and outrageous intrusion the Pacific Street Interchange option will have on our wetlands and our neighborhoods. It translates directly into a level of noise, visual, air pollution that cannot be mitigated and will significantly reduce our quality of life. And it increase and only fuels our dependency on the automobile. The 520 DEIS fails to give any consideration to these longterm and cumulative effects.

C-019-003

In closing, our members that represent neighborhoods from across this city categorically reject the six lane options especially the Pacific Street option. We urge you to do your job and fully assess the negative impacts accompanying these alternatives and give much more consideration to four lane options and other options that don't simply fuel unsustainable growth in Seattle and the region. Please include our comments in the final DEIS for 520.

Thank you.

John V. Fox Coordinator Seattle Displacement Coalition 206- 632-0668 4554 12th NE Seattle, Wa. 98105

C-019-003

Comment Summary:

6-Lane Alternative

Response:

See Section 1.2 of the 2006 Draft EIS Comment Response Report.